

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-21, and 23-27 were pending for examination. This amendment amends claims 1, 8-10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27, and cancels claim 20. No new claims have been added. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-27 will stand pending for examination. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims, for at least the reasons presented below.

A Final Office Action mailed February 25, 2008 rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,593 to Jennings (hereinafter "Jennings") and *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools* by Aho et al. (hereinafter "Aho"); and rejected claims 26 and 27 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jennings and Aho, and U.S. Patent No. 5,933,140 to Strahorn et al. (hereinafter "Strahorn").

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "receiving, from a server and at a computer system, a web-based application for display in a web browser, the application comprising one or more web pages," to delete the language "the markup language stream," to replace the term "UI objects in a portion of the particular application with "graphical element in the web-based application," and to recite "outputting one or more UI objects that correspond to the at least one graphical element in the web-based application." Claim 19 has been amended in similar fashion. Dependent claims 8-10, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27 have been amended to correct various typographical errors and for consistency with the claims from which they depend.

Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, including *inter alia*, on pages 3, 7 and 8 of the specification as filed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Jennings, in view of Aho

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings, in view of Aho. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and it is submitted that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case that any pending claim is unpatentable under § 103(a). Specifically, we respectfully submit that neither Jennings, Aho, nor the combination of the two references teaches or suggests each element of any rejected claim.

For example, claim 1, as amended, recites "receiving, from a server and at a computer system, a web-based application for display in a web browser, the web-based application comprising one or more web pages." Jennings neither teaches nor suggests this feature. Instead, Jennings teaches the generation of an application by an interactor, based on interface description documents. *See* Jennings, col. 6, lines 45-50 ("Interactor 130 . . . reflects the contents of [description] documents 122 and 124 into object model 310 to create an instance thereof in executable form. Interactor 130 then executes that instance by using downloadable layout object plug-ins 128 and connector object plug-ins 126 to create a corresponding user interface 132."). These description documents are generated by the system of Jennings, and they "define[] a desired user interface comprising one or more definition elements (e.g., display pages, announcement menus)" and "defin[e] interaction of the user interface with the application." Jennings, col. 3, lines 12-17.

These description documents are not web-based applications for display in a web browser, and they certainly do not comprise one or more web pages. In fact, while Jennings discusses the standard web application model, *see* Jennings, col. 7, line 12 – col. 8, line 5, Jennings specifically distinguishes its "interactor" from a typical web browser. Specifically, Jennings notes, "[w]hile browsers reflect documents into a predefined document object model (DOM), the interactor's object model 310 is not predefined by rather is specified by description documents 122 and 124 and plug-ins 126 and 128. And while a browser is visible to the user and has an appearance . . . , interactor 130 is invisible to the user" Jennings, col. 8, lines 19-26.

Hence, Jennings neither teaches nor suggests (and, in fact teaches away from) "receiving . . . a web-based application for display in a web browser, the web-based application comprising one or more web pages," as recited by claim 1. Aho, which is directed merely to the implementation of compilers, adds nothing to the disclosure of Jennings in this respect. Accordingly, for this reason alone, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Jennings and Aho.

Moreover, claim 1, as amended, recites "scanning a document object model (DOM) of the web based application with the parser computer program to generate tokens." As noted above, Jennings fails to teach or suggest any operations pertaining to such a web-based application. Even if Jennings did disclose a web-based application, however, Jennings still would fail to teach or suggest scanning a DOM of such an application, as recited by claim 1. In fact, Jennings teaches away from scanning the DOM of an application; instead, as quoted above, Jennings teaches that its interactor, unlike a web browser, builds its own DOM based on the description documents. Hence, even if Jennings were to receive a web-based application having a DOM, the system of Jennings would ignore that DOM and would instead build its own DOM based on description documents, not on the web-based application itself.

Hence, Jennings also fails to teach or suggest "scanning a document object model (DOM) of the web-based application with the parser computer program to generate tokens." Aho likewise fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over any combination of Jennings and/or Aho, for at least this additional reason.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite elements similar to those described above and therefore is believed to be allowable over Jennings and/or Aho for at least similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 8-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-25 each ultimately depend from either claim 1 or claim 19, and each of these dependent claims is believed to be allowable over Jennings and/or Aho at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Jennings and Aho, further in view of Strahorn

The Office Action has rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings and Aho, as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Strahorn. Claims 26 and 27 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively. Claim 26, therefore, necessarily includes each element of claim 1, and claim 27 likewise includes each element of claim 19. As noted above, claim 1 and 19 are allowable over the combination of Jennings and Aho.

Strahorn, which is cited merely as teaching "context-based help based upon a particular portion of the application," Final Office Action at 9, adds nothing to remedy the failings of Jennings and Aho, discussed above. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 are allowable over any combination of Jennings, Aho, and Strahorn, and claims 26 and 27 are allowable as well, at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CEK:jep
61726319 v1